



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,181	02/12/2002	Hal Hildebrand	2222.5390002	8962
26111	7590	09/24/2009		
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			BATES, KEVIN T	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2456	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/076,181	Applicant(s) HILDEBRAND ET AL.
	Examiner KEVIN BATES	Art Unit 2456

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 10-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1450B)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on June 5, 2009.

Claims 1-9 and 28 have been cancelled.

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are currently amended.

Claims 10-27 and 29-36 are currently pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 18, and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a "tangible computer-readable medium", this claim language is not supported by any disclosure in the specification.

Claims 19-20, 22-24, and 31-33 contain the same claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-27 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra (5757920) in view of Zhao (6035404).

Regarding claims 10, 18 and 21, Misra teaches a method for providing access to a secured item comprising:

(a) authenticating a user to a first (Column 7, lines 53 – 65; Column 5, lines 10 – 21) having the secured item stored therein (Column 5, lines 10 - 14);

Misra further teaches when the user is accessing from a second location, authenticating the user at a second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 21; Col. 7, lines 23-30).

Misra does not explicitly indicate preventing access to the second server while the user is accessing the first server ; wherein the user is disconnected from the first server before being connected to the second server when the user is at a second location.

Zhao teaches a system for connecting to a distributed access control system (Col. 3, lines 31 – 49); where when the user attempts to access the network while a concurrent access from that use account is being made, authenticating the user at the second location, disconnecting the previous connection, and allowing the new connection to gain access to the system (Col. 4, line 1 – 10; Col. 6, line 40 – Col. 7, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Zhao's teaching to allow some control over the number of

sessions and connections single accounts to hopefully protect the network from being exposed to improper entry.

Regarding claims 29, 31, and 34, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 10, 18, and 21, wherein step (a) comprises:

authenticating the user with the first server with respect to a previous access request (Column 7, lines 53 – 65);

subsequently receiving a current access request via the second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 21); and

authenticating the user with the second server with respect to the current access request (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, where the user roams into a second domain, which can include using a different computer in the second domain, see Col. 7, lines 23-30).

Regarding claims 30, 32, and 35, Misra teaches the method as recited in claims 29, 31, and 34.

Misra does not explicitly indicate that wherein the method comprises:

upon receiving the current access request via the second server, identifying a first local module previously supporting the user at the first server;

reconfiguring the first local module at the first server to remove support for the user at the first server;

identifying a second local module to support the user at the second server; and

reconfiguring the second local module at the second server to add support for the user at the second server .

Zhao teaches a system which the ability to disconnect a first user connection when a concurrent user request for a session is made (Col. 4, line 1 – 10; Col. 6, line 40 – Col. 7, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Zhao's teaching of preventing concurrent user sessions in the system in Misra's system which would enable the domains in Misra to communicate in order to disconnect previous sessions and configure new sessions in the multiple domains in Misra.

Regarding claims 11, 22, and 25, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 10, 31, and 21, wherein step (a1) authenticates both the user and a client machine being used by the user (Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 9).

Regarding claims 12 and 26, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 21, wherein the first and the second servers are access points for the user to gain access to the secured item (Column 5, lines 10 – 14).

Regarding claims 13 and 23, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 29 and 32, wherein when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server, and when the user is at a second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server using a second client at the second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 14, 20, and 27, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 32, and 35, wherein said method further comprises: determining, prior to disconnecting the user from the first connection, whether the user is permitted to gain access through a second location to the secured item via the second server (Column 5, lines 10 – 16).

Regarding claim 15, Misra teaches a method as recited in claim 39, wherein said the authenticating the user with the first server occurs while the user is at a first location, and wherein receiving the access request occurs while the user is at a second location (Column 5, lines 10 – 21, wherein the system has a home location with maintains the credentials and authorization, which is then distributed through the server system).

Regarding claims 16 and 24, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 17 and 33, wherein said method further comprises:

upon receiving the current access request to access the secured item via the second server, determining permitted locations from which the user is permitted to access to the secured item;

determining, whether the second location is one of the permitted locations for the user; and

bypassing the disconnecting the user from the first connection in response to the determination that the second location is not one of the permitted locations for the user (Column 5, lines 10 – 21).

Regarding claims 17, 19, and 33, Misra teaches a method as recited in claims 30, 31, and 32, wherein:

when the user is at the first location, the user interacts over a network with the first server using a first client machine at the first location, and

when the user is at the second location, the user interacts over a network with the second server using a second client machine at the second location (Column 3, line 67 – Column 4, line 7; Column 4, line 66 – Column 5, line 2; Column 5, lines 10 – 19, wherein the user and machine locations are roaming in the system and which ever domain the user/machine combination logs in at it connects to that domains controller which is the same location as the machine location).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN BATES whose telephone number is (571)272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/KEVIN BATES/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2456